

# Electron focusing, mode spectroscopy and mass enhancement in small GaAs/AlGaAs rings

J. Liu<sup>1</sup>, K. Ismail<sup>2,4</sup>, K. Y. Lee<sup>3,4</sup>, J. M. Hong<sup>4</sup>  
and S. Washburn<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3255, USA.*

<sup>2</sup> *Dept. of Telecommunication and Elec. Eng., University of Cairo,  
Cairo, Egypt.*

<sup>3</sup> *IBM East Fishkill, Hopewell Junction, NY 12533, USA.*

<sup>4</sup> *IBM Watson Research Center, Yorktown, NY 10598, USA.*

A new electron focusing effect has been discovered in small single and coupled GaAs/AlGaAs rings. The focusing in the single ring is attributed solely to internal orbits. The focusing effect allows the ring to be used as a small mass spectrometer. The focusing causes peaks in the magnetoresistance at low fields, and the peak positions were used to study the dispersion relation of the one-dimensional magnetoelectric subbands. The electron effective mass increases with the applied magnetic field by a factor of 50, at a magnetic field of  $0.5T$ . This is the first time this increase has been measured directly. General agreement obtains between the experiment and the subband calculations for straight channels.

72.20.My, 73.20.Dx, 85.30.Tv.

February 1, 2008, submitted to Physical Review Letters

In 1897, Thompson [1] invented the mass spectrometer, which was later refined by Bainbridge [2] and others. Mass spectroscopy involves bending the trajectory of particles emitted from a point source with a magnetic field and using a point collector to select a particular orbit size,  $l_c = mv/eB$ . Electron focusing in the solid state is analogous to this magnetic focusing of electrons in vacuum. A magnetic field is used again to focus the electrons injected by a point contact into a second point contact a distance  $L$  away [3], but in the solid state, the electrons can bounce specularly from walls in the sample [4,5]. In the conventional mass spectrometer, the momentum of the particle is fixed by an external electric field that accelerates the particle, but in the solid states experiments, the Fermi energy determines the velocity [3]. The focusing condition is that the cyclotron orbit diameter  $2l_c$  be an integer fraction of  $L$ ,  $L = 2jl_c = 2j\hbar k_F/eB$ . Focusing peaks appear in the magnetoresistance  $R(B)$  because of skipping orbits such as the external trajectories on the two-ring sample in the inset of Figure 1. Here  $l_c$  is the cyclotron radius, and  $j - 1 = 0, 1, 2, 3...$  is the number of bounces in the trajectory. Solid state focusing has been employed to study surface scattering in metals [4], and electron propagation in semiconductors [5]. In these experiments, the electron traveled in the half space bounded by the surface through which they were injected, and they bounced specularly from that smooth surface, but focusing can occur for electrons confined to move in circular tracks [2] such as the loop depicted in the inset of Fig. 1 [6]. In such a loop, electrons inside the ring are focused away from the outlet port when  $l_c$  matches the loop radius  $r$ . As a result, the ring acts like a trap: The resistance is enhanced and a focusing peak appears because of the internal orbit in the inset of Figure 1. If  $n$  transverse modes (subbands) are occupied in the wires forming the loop, then  $n$  different values of velocity parallel to the wire can be focused to achieve  $n$  peaks in  $R(B)$  as each  $l_{cn}$  matches  $r$ . This allows the loop to be used as a mass spectrometer that measures both energy and tangential momentum, and so map the dispersion relation  $E_n(k_n, B)$  for the modes in the wire. As we will show this allows us to make the first measurements of the enhancement of the cyclotron effective mass as the magnetic field increases and the dispersion in the magnetoelectric subbands [7,8].

Our samples were fabricated on a standard high-mobility GaAs/AlGaAs modulation-doped layer (carrier density  $n_s = 2 \times 10^{15}/m^2$  and mobility  $\mu = 90m^2/Vsec$ ) grown by molecular beam epitaxy. The ring geometry was defined by a shallow mesa formed through a wet etching technique [6], and metal gate covers all active portions of the device. More details of the fabrication are reported elsewhere [6]. The rings have radii  $r = 0.85\mu m$  and line widths  $t = 0.3\mu m$ . Earlier experiments on similar samples have shown clear conductance quantization and electrical focusing effects at  $T = 4.2K$ , and large Aharonov-Bohm oscillations up to a (20% modulation of  $R(0)$ ) at  $T < 0.1K$  [6]. This was the first time that the mode counting effects were seen at such length scales, and the first observation of focusing in loops. Such evidence assures us that the transport in the loops is ballistic. All experiments reported here were conducted at  $T = 4.2K$ . The resistance was measured with a standard four-probe lock-in method at a frequency of  $23.6Hz$  and at  $1mV$  (rms) excitation voltage.

Figure 1 shows the conductance  $G$  as a function of gate voltage  $V_g$  at  $B = 0$  for the single ring and double rings. Mode counting conductance steps [9,10] occur in both single and double ring samples. The average heights of the steps are  $0.75$  and  $1.3 e^2/h$ , respectively, which are consistent with the results of the previous experiment [6]. In this figure we also show where the subband bottoms  $E_n(0,0)$  cross  $E_F$  in the single ring, as determined by the peaks in derivative  $dG/dV_g$ .

Figure 2 contains  $R(B)$  for the single ring, which contains a series of peaks on a smooth background. (We remark that similar peaks have been observed previously in rings formed on samples patterned without any etching. [12]) Analysis of the double ring data is complicated because of the competition between internal and external orbits, so we will discuss only the single ring, where focusing results entirely from internal orbits, from now on.

We are interested in the focusing peaks, so we have subtracted the smooth part of  $R(B)$ . We are not sure of the origin of the large negative  $R(B)$  in our experiment, but we speculate that it might result in part from steering the incoming beam away from head-on collision with (and concomitant strong reflection from) the inner wall of the loop. We used a

quasi-Lorentzian functional form,

$$R(B) = R_0 - \frac{\Delta}{1 + (B/B_c)^{2.3}} \quad (1)$$

to fit  $R(B)$  (dashed line). The power 2.3 is chosen simply because it gives us the best fit, but the results discussed below do *not* depend on this choice. Since the focusing effect at the outlet port increases the resistance, we only used the low resistance portions (heavy lines) in the fit, allowing both  $\Delta$  and  $B_c$  as free parameters. After subtracting the smooth part, we nominally have the net contribution of the focusing, which contains several peaks. In addition, one sees the onset of Shubnikov-deHaas (SdH) oscillations ( $\sim 0.5T$  to  $\sim 1T$ ). The peak positions are then mapped by fitting a Gaussian function,

$$\Delta R = Ie^{-[(B-B_0)/\Delta B]^2} + aB + c. \quad (2)$$

to the data in the neighborhood of each peak, where the last two terms allow for imperfect subtraction and overlap of the peaks. The resulting center field  $B_0$ , normalization factor  $I$ , and mean deviation  $\Delta B$  yield the peak position, intensity and width, respectively. We will discuss the latter two parameters more in a forthcoming publication, and here we will concentrate interpreting the peak positions.

Starting with the relation  $l_c = \hbar k_F / eB$ , one can show that the cyclotron effective mass is  $m_{cn} = \hbar^2 k / (dE_n / dk)$  and tangential (group) velocity is  $v_n = dE_n / \hbar dk$  [11]. The focusing condition now becomes  $r = l_{cn} = \hbar k_{Fn} / eB$ , which is the same form as in free space, but with the Fermi wave-vector  $k_{Fn}$  *tangential to the arm of the loop*. This allows us to infer  $k_{Fn}$  from the peak positions. After measuring  $E_F(V_g)$  via the SdH effect ( $0 < B < 6T$ ) to be  $E_F = 5.98V_g + 15.4$  (meV), we have the dispersion relation directly. Figure 3 contains  $E_F$  as a function of peak position  $B_0$  (upper axis) and (through the focusing condition) the corresponding wave-vectors (lower axis) in convenient units  $2\pi/r$ . Data from  $n = 1$  is omitted because it is sensitive to the functional form (1).

To our knowledge, there have been no calculations of the dispersion relation of a circular channel, but there have been quite a few discussions about the straight channels [10]. Since

for the data of interest, the ring radius is at least two orders of magnitude larger than the Fermi wavelength (notice the order of magnitude on the lower abscissa for Fig. 3), we will use the results for straight channels. A good model of the electrostatic confinement potential comprises a flat bottom plus parabolic walls [13,7],  $V(|x| > t/2) = m\omega_0^2(|x| - t/2)^2/2$  and  $V(|x| < t/2) = 0$ , where  $m = 0.067m_e$  is the effective mass for two-dimensional GaAs/AlGaAs (100) electron gas. At  $B = 0$ , the problem has been solved analytically [14] with the result

$$E_n(k, 0) = E_n(0, 0) + \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m}, \quad (3)$$

where the offset of the subband bottom is

$$E_n(0, 0) = \left\{ E_P \left[ \frac{4(n + 1/2)}{E_P} + \frac{1}{E_S} \right]^{1/2} - \left[ \frac{1}{E_S} \right]^{1/2} \right\}^2 \quad (4)$$

where  $E_S = (\pi\hbar)^2/2mt^2$  and  $E_P = \hbar\omega_0/2$  are ground state energies for square (width  $t$ ) and parabolic wells, respectively. The effective mass is not changed by the electrostatic confinement.

We can now compare the measured  $E_n(0, 0)$  from Figure 1 ( $B = 0$ ) with these formulae as shown in the inset of Figure 4. The agreement of the data with a parabolic form (solid line) means that the deviation from a square well is negligible. The inferred well width is  $t = 0.3\mu m$ , in agreement with the lithographic linewidth. The fit also yielded a barrier energy  $E_c = 13.1 meV$ , which defines the bottom of the potential well [8].

For  $B > 0$ , the electron is in a new potential comprising the electrostatic part plus a magnetic potential  $V_b = m\omega_c^2(x - x_0)^2/2$ , where  $x_0 = -\hbar k/eB$ . For  $t = 0$ , the new potential is just a shifted parabola, so the solution is a new harmonic oscillator [15,10], but with a new curvature  $\omega = (\omega_c^2 + \omega_0^2)^{1/2}$ , and an enhanced effective  $m^* = m\omega_c^2/\omega_0^2$ . The subband bottom rises and eventually approaches the Landau level when  $\omega_c \gg \omega_0$ . The dispersion relation is still parabolic in  $k$ , but with a mass that increases with  $B$  but is independent of  $n$ .

The solution for  $B > 0$  and  $t > 0$  is complicated by the flat part. [7] An effective mass  $m^*$  still describes the dispersion curve  $E_n(k, B) = E_{noff} + \hbar^2 k^2/2m^*$ , with  $m^*$  defined above, in

the low  $B$  and high  $n$  limit. Since this equation is not necessarily true in the limit  $k \rightarrow 0$ , the significance of  $E_{noff}$  is not clear [7]. One must apply these formulae to the data advisedly since  $B$  is not fixed while the dispersion in  $k$  is traced, but since the range over which each peak is studied is small we can safely approximate  $B$  as a constant in the analysis. The solid curves in Fig. 3 are fits to (3) with  $m^*$  and  $E_{noff}$  as free parameters. The resulting effective masses are displayed in Fig. 4. The effective mass increases about 50 fold! For  $n = 7$  to  $n = 4$ ,  $m^*$  is described quite well by the parabolic dependence discussed above, but there is significant deviation at higher field where the Landau level is beginning to form. From the fit, we get  $m^*(B = 0) = 0.95$ , in excellent agreement with the ideal value 1.

The enhancement of effective mass by the magnetic field in one-dimensional subbands has been known theoretically for some time, but for two reasons, this is the first experimental measurement. First, in the usual ballistic one-dimensional conductance experiments, [10]  $k$  and  $m^*$  (the density of states) cancel each other and lead to the quantized conductance steps. Second, experiments designed to study the magnetoelectric subbands, usually through the SdH effect, measure the magnetic depopulation of the subbands, and are intrinsically mostly sensitive to the subband bottoms. Except in studies of the sharpening of the depopulation peaks [7], little attention has been paid to the mass enhancement. In contrast, our sample acts like a small mass spectrometer and provides a direct measurement of the subband dispersion relation and the carrier mass.

The formula for the cyclotron orbit size is very general; it holds even when the dispersion relation is not parabolic and the effective mass  $m^*$  loses its meaning. Hence, there is no particular reason we could not extend it into the dispersionless range. This point is worthy of further experiments. That the transverse momenta of the modes are not relaxed in the outlet region is interesting, too. Potentially, it could be used to study the mode relaxation and coupling. Possible variations, such as widening the outlet, or placing a barrier in the outlet or in one arm of the ring, could be designed.

In conclusion, we remark that we have observed the electron focusing effect in a single ring. The magnetoresistance peak positions, corresponding to the cyclotron radii of different

subbands matching the ring radius, directly yielded the dispersion relation of the subbands. Calculations for subbands in straight channels agreed with the data if the lateral electric confinement was modeled as a flat bottom plus a parabolic wall. The fitted well parameters were self-consistent, and agreed with other independent estimates. The modeling allowed us to observe directly the subband dispersion  $E_n(k)$  and the enhancement of the cyclotron effective mass.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: This work was supported with funding from IBM, the Microelectronics Center of North Carolina and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. We would like to thank K. Li, V. Long, Y. Wang, and W. Gao for their assistance in this experiment and M. Büttiker, J. Davies and H. Baranger for valuable conversations.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. J. Thompson, Phil. Mag. **44**, 293 (1897).
- [2] K. T. Bainbridge, Phys. Rev. **40**, 130 (1932).
- [3] Yu. V. Sharvin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **48**, 984 (1965) [Sov. Phys. JETP **21**, 655 (1965)].
- [4] V. S. Tsoi, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **19**, 114 (1974) [JETP Lett. **19**, 70 (1974)]; Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **68**, 1849 (1975) [JETP Lett. **41**, 927 (1975)].
- [5] H. van Houten, C.W.J. Beenakker, J.G. Williamson, M.E.I. Broekaart, P.H.M. van Loosdrecht, B.J. van Wees, J.E. Mooij, C.T. Foxon and J.J. Harris, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 8556 (1989). **58**, 1567 (1987).
- [6] K. Ismail, S. Washburn and K. Y. Lee, Appl. Phys. Lett. **59**, 1998 (1991); K. Y. Lee, D. P. Kern, K. Ismail and S. Washburn, J. Vac. Sci. Tech. **B9**, 2834 (1991); S. Washburn, K. Ismail and K. Y. Lee, in *Quantum Effect Physics, Electronics and Applications*, ed K. Ismail, T. Ikoma and H. I. Smith (Adam Hilger, 1992).
- [7] K. -F. Berggren, G. Roos, and H. van Houten, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 10118 (1988); K. -F. Berggren, T. J. Thornton, D. J. Newson and M. Pepper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1769 (1986). K. -F. Berggren, and D. J. Newson, Semicond. Sci. Technol. **1**, 327 (1986).
- [8] B. J. van Wees, L. P. Kouwenhoven, H. van Houten, C. W. J. Beenakker, J. E. Mooij, C. T. Foxon and J. J. Harris, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 3625 (1988), D. A. Wharam, U. Eckenberg, M. Pepper, D. G. Hasko, H. Ahmed, J. E. F. Frost, D. A. Ritchie, D. C. Peacock and G. A. C. Jones, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 6283 (1989).
- [9] B. J. van Wees, H. van Houten, C. W. J. Beenakker, J. G. Williamson, L. P. Kouwenhoven, D. van der Marel, and C. T. Foxon Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 848 (1988), D. A. Wharam, T. J. Thornton, R. Newbury, M. Pepper, H. Ahmed, J. E. F. Frost, D. G. Hasko, D. C. Peacock D. A. Ritchie, and G. A. C. Jones, J. Phys. C **21**, L209 (1988).



- [10] C. W. J. Beenakker and H. van Houten, "Quantum Transport in Semiconductor Nanostructures," in *Solid State Physics, Volume 44*, ed. H. Ehrenreich and D. Turnbull, (Academic Press, London, 1991).
- [11] There is a difference between dispersion effective mass  $m^*$  and cyclotron effective mass  $m_c$ , but often the two are equal. The cyclotron effective mass is defined as  $m_c(E) = (\hbar^2/2\pi)dA(E)/dE$ , where  $A(E)$  is the k-space area enclosed by equal-potential  $E$ . Invoking a dispersion relation  $E_n(k)$  for the tangential wavevector  $k$ , and bearing in mind that the equal-potential contour is a circle (because the ring is round), one finds that  $m^* = \hbar^2 k/(dE_n/dk)$ . See, e.g. J. M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids*, (Cambridge, Cambridge, 1986)
- [12] C. J. B. Ford, T. J. Thornton, R. Newbury, M. Pepper, H. Ahmed, C. T. Foxon, J. J. Harris and C. Roberts, J. Phys. C **21** L325 (1988); S. Katsumoto, N. Sano and S. Kobayashi J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61**, 1153 (1992).
- [13] S. E. Laux and F. Stern, Appl. Phys. Lett. **49**, 91 (1986); S. E. Laux D. J. Frank and F. Stern, Surf. Sci. **196**, 101 (1988).
- [14] D. A. Poole, M. Pepper, K. -F. Berggren, G. Hill and H. W. Myron, J. Phys. C **15**, L21 (1982).
- [15] S. B. Kaplan, and A. C. Warren, Physical Rev. B **34**, 1346 (1986).

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. The inset is a schematic for the single ring and coupled double ring. The sizes marked are in the units of  $\mu m$ . The dashed lines illustrate internal and external focusing orbits. Conductance versus gate voltage is shown for the single ring and double rings.  $T = 4.2K$ . the position of the turn-on voltage for the modes are determined by the derivatives  $dG/dV_g$  (dashed line) for the single ring.

FIG. 2.  $R(B)$  the single ring at  $V_g = 0.55V$  (solid line), is fit to (1) (dashed line), which accounts for the smooth background magnetoresistance. The difference between the two,  $\delta R$  is the contribution of the focusing effect.

FIG. 3. The focusing peak positions for subband indices 2 - 7. The solid curves are fits to (11) treating the effective mass  $m^*$  and offset energy  $E_{noff}$  as free parameters.

FIG. 4. The effective mass  $m^*/m$  obtained from Figure 3 as a function of the average magnetic field for each subband. At low field, it fits well with a parabolic function (solid line). The inset contains the zero field subband bottom energy as a function of the band indices  $n$ . The solid curve is a least-square fit to the square well prediction.